

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

In re L.L., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

B216852
(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. YJ32421)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

L.L.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.

Wayne C. Denton, Juvenile Court Referee. Affirmed.

Stephen Borgo, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602, a two-count petition was filed alleging that appellant, L.L., committed a residential burglary in violation of Penal Code section 459, and received stolen property in violation of Penal Code section 496.

Our review of the appellate record reveals the following facts: On September 25, 2008, Richard Dapsi returned to his home at approximately 11:30 a.m. and found several police officers on his property. The officers had responded to a possible burglary at Mr. Dapsi's home. Later that evening, Mr. Dapsi's son found a backpack in an area adjacent to his backyard, which contained several items which belonged to Mr. Dapsi, including a laptop computer, camcorder, software, and jars containing rolls of coins.

On that same day, Mr. Dapsi's neighbor, Carmen Davis, was stopped at a stop sign directly in front of Mr. Dapsi's house when she noticed two African American boys in Mr. Dapsi's yard. Davis watched as one of the boys walked toward the back of the house and the other walked away from the house. Both boys had backpacks.

A short time later, Peter Branch was driving in the area when he saw two African American boys run in front of him, and a lady waving at him as if asking for help. Mr. Branch drove past the boys and stopped his car in front of them, but the youth fled onto a nearby property. Mr. Branch got out of his car and ran after the boys. The boys split up and proceeded in different directions. Mr. Branch pursued one of the boys, whom he later caught up with and identified as appellant. Mr. Branch had earlier seen appellant with a backpack, but he no longer had a backpack when Mr. Branch caught up with him. The police arrived, detained appellant, and located a backpack nearby. Two containers of coins were found in the backpack, which Mr. Dapsi identified as his property.

The juvenile court sustained the residential burglary count and dismissed the receiving stolen property count. Appellant was placed home on probation and was ordered to pay restitution in the amount of \$100. He filed a timely notice of appeal.

After examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief which contained an acknowledgment that he had been unable to find any arguable issues. On October 5,

2009, we advised defendant that he had 30 days in which to personally submit any contentions or arguments which he wished this court to consider. No response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that defendant's appellate attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.) Specifically, the testimony of Mr. Dapsi, Ms. Davis, and Mr. Branch, as well as that of Officers Tellez and Dewyke of the Los Angeles Police Department, provide substantial evidence to support the juvenile court's ruling.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

ARMSTRONG, J.

We concur:

TURNER, P. J.

KRIEGLER, J.